

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending. By this Response, claims 1, 6 and 9 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Seeley, et al. (US 6,097,429). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In embodiments of the present invention, an area in a recorded image is extracted. The extracted area is from within the image and therefore does not refer to the entire image area. Objects within the extracted image are then extracted by each of a plurality of monitoring modules. The objects are classified in different categories. Certain classified objects are then transmitted in a stylized manner. Only the data representing the extracted area of the image is transmitted in a stylized manner.

In contrast, Seeley teaches that a “thumbnail” of an entire image area is transmitted from a site control unit. The entire image is scaled down to create the “thumbnail.” An area in an image is not extracted to create the thumbnail. The area used to create the thumbnail is not in the image but instead is the image that encompasses the entire image area. The thumbnail is transmitted and therefore transmitting data representing only the extracted area of the image is in a stylized manner is not taught. Thus, even if the Examiner considers the “thumbnail” as a stylized representation of an image, it does not teach applicant’s claimed features of extracting an area in an image and transmitting data representing only the extracted area of the image in a stylized manner.

Further, embodiments of the invention provide a monitoring module which comprises a light sensitive sensor and which is arranged to carry out computer based analysis of an image. Therefore, the computer based analysis is performed in the same physical entity which is arranged to monitor a location. This implies that the computer based analysis is provided at the specific location being monitored.

Seeley does not disclose that the computer based analysis of an image is provided in the physical location of a light sensitive sensor. Instead, Seeley teaches that the images from video cameras are transmitted to one or more site control units. The Examiner asserts that applicant's previous arguments have been based on the fact that Seeley teaches the use of only one site control unit. However, even when several site control units are used, each site control unit is centrally arranged to receive transmitted images from a plurality of video cameras. See Figs. 4 and 6. Thus, Seeley does not disclose that a site control unit merely serves one video camera. Further, even though a site control unit may be connected to only one video camera, Seeley does not disclose of the site control unit is arranged in the same physical entity as the video camera in order to form a monitoring module.

Therefore, in view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that Seeley fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, transmitting ...data representing only the extracted area of the image in a stylized way to the monitoring station, as recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 9.

Also, Seeley fails to teach or suggest *inter alia*, extracting in each of the monitoring modules an area in the recorded image that differs from a reference image, extracting in each of the monitoring modules an object from the area, classifying in each of the monitoring modules the object based on characteristics, such as a characteristic of the type: size, shape and/or

movement history, associated with the object, if the object is a human alarm object, as recited in claim 1.

Also, Seeley fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the monitoring modules being arranged to carry out computer based analysis of the image, which comprises extracting an area from the image that differs from a reference image, extracting an object from the area, classifying the object based on characteristics, such as a characteristic of the type: size, shape and/or movement history, associated with the object, as recited in claims 6 and 9.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that Seeley fails to teach each and every feature of independent claims 1, 6 and 9 as required. Further, dependent claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 are distinguishable for the above reasons as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Reg. No. 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH,
LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant